













**DIARY.**

Mr. W. BURTON claimed a right to explain the matter.

Mr. FORSTER rose to order, and submitted that the member who had possession of the chair should be interrupted.

Mr. JAMES MAGAURA continued: The amendment characterized as insidious, and the gentlemen who characterized the views he did not share with wish to depose the speaker. He denied that. He said and maintained that the Chief Justice had brought forward his amendment solely because he considered it believed that it would be the best course for the

adopt. Some reference has been made to the Church of England in England. Now, the united Church of England and Ireland, as it existed in the British islands, was a State Church, but here it was a State Church; but, on the contrary, its principle was that of religious equality to all Christian persuasions, and, besides this, the Church asserted the inherent right of self-government in the management of its affairs. But he denied that any system of Church Government was an essential part of religious system. He referred in support of this statement to Archbishop Paley's

the Bishop having an unqualified veto, and denied if the amendment were adopted the high office of Bishop would be degraded to the Presbyterian platform. Bishop vested with the power which they highly desirable, he denied would be like the minister of the Presbyterian Church. He recalled the action of the Assembly to the fact that a member of the Presbyterian Church was annually elected had not those administrative powers which belonged to the Bishop, and had not that high position which belonged to the Episcopal office. He thought

the question he had alluded to was sufficient answer the charge brought against them, that they were attempting to lower the Episcopal authority of the Synod to that of the Presbyterian moderator. The member said the total number of members of the Church of England in this country was between 132,000 and 133,000. He supposed that the number of representatives they had returned to the Synod would be about 70; this, together with the clergy, including the Bishop, would make the number of members something like 120. He maintained that if they granted this vote to the Bishop

He would be giving the clergy two votes, in-  
cluding the Bishop's veto, and the lay element only.  
He asked whether that was not a ridiculous propo-  
sition, and whether that proposition was in accord-  
ance with popular liberty. He told them emphati-  
cally, if they were to have a system of Church Go-  
vernment, it must be a popular system. (Hear,  
hear.) The hon. member concluded a lengthy address  
stating his intention to support the amendment.  
Mr. Hearst said that he believed in the Apostolic  
cession, and could not therefore be opposed to

any manner to transfer the episcopal office, but at the same time he thought he might fairly doubt whether the divine appointment of the Bishop gave him an absolute control over the temporalities of the arch as that which was sought to be conferred by bill under discussion. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that there were three orders in the arch, he denied that the consent of the three orders to the present proposition could be concourant, because the Bishop could never initiate anything which was to come before the Conference, and, being of that opinion, he thought the power proposed to be

ferred on the Bishop was too great in reference to temporal matters. In matters spiritual he would give absolute veto to the Bishop.

Sir W. BURNES, in explanation, said that he did not the word "insidious" in reference to Sir Alfred when the other evening.

The Rev. G. TUNNICLIFFE considered that the Conference had not to deal with spiritual but with temporal matters. He did not think that the Bishops of this country possessed any less power than the Anglican Bishops, but there were pressing upon bishops of this country difficulties which were not pressing upon the bishops of other countries.

the character and office of the Bishop, which ought to fall upon the shoulders of churchwardens and the laity. Arguments on both sides had been so conflicting, he could make neither one thing nor another of it. On the principle of a popular Church, and a useful Church—on the principle of anything but a Church which should in the slightest degree recur to the past and darker ages, he should unhesitatingly vote for amendment of his Honor the Chief Justice.

MR. MARTINDALE expressed his intention of vot-

the Rev. W. STACE thought it would be unwise to have the consideration of the matter to the Synod, as all the discussion which had taken place upon the subject. He was prepared to support a veto of kind—that in the event of a measure coming from two Houses, and being disapproved of by the Bishop, the Bishop should give his reasons for disapproval, the message should return to the Houses, and neither House a full third of the members then

The Rev. T. Drury disclaimed all party motives in the discussion of the question before the Conference. He considered the Church as one body, in which there were three orders of ministers—deacons, presbyters, and bishops. Now, as they formed one body he did not see that there could be that frightful antagonism which some seemed to anticipate. He thought there was a good deal of unnecessary fear in reference to the popular element was gaining ground so fast that no man, be his position what it might in society, could be able to domineer over those who were about

Dr. FOSTER contended that the right of the Bishop as a clergyman to sit in the Synod divested him of any right to power or authority as a third estate. Future Synods would have a right to settle questions in reference to the privilege and status of bishops, and he determined to determine whether the veto should be given or not; but it was with him not so much a question whether the veto was right or expedient to grant the veto to the Bishop as a question whether it was right or expedient to give it.

ated for the Conference to entertain the question." It seemed to him that those who advocated an absolute intended to substitute the Bishop for the Queen. He admitted the right of the Bishop in spiritual matters. He believed, however, that they were dealing with temporalities, and he saw nothing in the bill with regard to the investiture of temporalities in the monarch. This he considered an extraordinary omission. The question was one which affected not only the clergy. It was a vital question to the clergy. At one time he had thought of retiring from the discussion, but one of the reasons which had sustained him in the

res he had taken, was his desire to provide some protection to the clerical order against the despotism of the bishops. He would vote against any clause which assumed to deal with the question of the absolute veto; and, if called upon, he would vote for any amendment which placed a limitation on the power of a Bishop in any shape whatever. He should give vote in favour of the amendment; and, if that was voted, then against the clause, because he had no right to inflict upon the Church of this diocese anything which might be converted into an instrument of

Mr. C. KEMP, in reference to what had fallen from last speaker concerning temporalities, remarked that power would be given to call for accounts. The Conference, after having adjourned for an hour, assembled at eight o'clock, and the debate continued.

THE DEAN OF SYDNEY said he had heard nothing in discussion which had taken place before the ad-

nment, to induce him to change the opinions he previously entertained. He had been somewhat slow to hear the manner in which the American Episcopal Church had been occasionally spoken of. As a member of the United Church of England and Ireland, he thought the American Church deserved their sympathy and esteem; and he maintained that, although in the diocesan synods, the Bishops appeared to have given up the principle, there was an absolute veto in the house of Bishops which rested on the principle that they considered the property of the Bishops as a separate estate. He was pre-

ed to take from the Church of America that which was good, rejecting that which was evil. In England, a Bishop, in ecclesiastical law, was considered a corporation sole. He could not support the amendment of Sir Alfred Stephen because he thought it would lead to much contention as to where the Bishop should commence to interfere and where he should not. He hoped that the principle which was involved in the Bishop's office, as a separate estate, would not be sacrificed, and that they should not do that which would be of promoting the end which they had in view.

Mr. ROLLISTON wished to know what object was sought to be obtained by pressing upon the Conference the subject of the veto? He thought its object would be to restrict the Church in this colony, and to drive them out of their pale all those who would not bow the knee to the despotic power which it was sought by the Conference to set up. (Hear, hear, and No, no.)

au/nla.news-page149



the ship's complete control over his officers and his men, he seems to have assumed that he had some power over the passengers whom he conveyed. As a result, the passengers' wrongs, trifles are converted into importance, and it is their right to have things "widen go right" when the captain's wife is aboard, though, to do the lady justice in this instance, she contributed nothing more than the disturbance than which was more. But what a state of mind must a man have brought himself to who could actually believe that he has the right to direct his passengers, principally officers and crew, and that he has the right to demand what part of the table the light should shine on, and on their refusal to obey his direction, to threaten them all to bed in the dark at night over ordinary matters, such as the lighting of the staterooms, the naughty children! How wonderful the kicks and buffets of the world, must be the sum of a man who, because he was told that he has no right to do this, and also, which is perfectly true, that he has no right to direct his passengers in the relation as the landlord of an hotel, to believe that he had a right to fetter and imprison a gentleman in the presence of thirty or more passengers for the space of ten minutes. And how absurdly to suppose that he had the right which could induce the captain, who could not be justified in restraining a passenger from his liberty, the most absolute necessity, to go to his prison, and to say to him, "I am sorry, but if he would apologize for saying he was the captain, he would be free." Our wrongs are awarded to say for the











